



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 2, 2003

Mr. Steve Aragón
General Counsel
Texas Health and Human Services Commission
P.O. Box 13247
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2003-6963

Dear Mr. Aragón:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 188773.

The Texas Health and Human Services Commission (the "commission") received a request for "all documentation concerning the contract with Heritage Systems regarding [certain] audits." You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.108 and 552.137 of the Government Code. Although you take no position regarding whether the requested information is proprietary, you have notified Heritage Information Systems, Incorporated ("Heritage") and EDS of the request for information and their opportunity to submit comments to this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). In its brief to this office Heritage claims that portions of the requested information are excepted from disclosure pursuant to sections 552.108, 552.110, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered all claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

We begin by addressing the scope of this ruling. You have included information at Tabs 1 and 7 that you state is not responsive to this request. We do not address this information in this ruling. Furthermore, we note that most of the remaining information at Tab 7 was created after the date on which you state this request for information was received. Because these documents, which we have marked, are not encompassed by this request, we do not address them in this ruling either. *See Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v.*

Bustamante, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986) (governmental body not required to disclose information that did not exist at time request was received).

We turn now to Heritage's arguments that the information submitted at Tabs 2-6 consists of trade secrets. Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects the property interests of private persons by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision and (2) commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained.

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex.), cert. denied, 358 U.S. 898 (1958); see also Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). Section 757 provides that a trade secret is

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. . . . [It may] relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret as well as the Restatement's list of six trade secret factors. RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939).¹ This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with

¹The six factors that the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret are:

(1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company]; (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others involved in [the company's] business; (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information; (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors; (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information; (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2

regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) applies unless it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. See Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Having reviewed Heritage's arguments, we find that the company has established a *prima facie* case that the information at Tabs 2-6 consists of trade secrets, and we have not received any argument that rebuts this claim as a matter of law. Accordingly, pursuant to section 552.110, the commission must withhold this information.

We now address your arguments under section 552.108 of the Government Code for the information at Tab 7 that is responsive to this request. Section 552.108(a)(1) excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]" Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). An agency whose function is essentially regulatory in nature is not a "law enforcement agency" for purposes of section 552.108. See Open Records Decision No. 199 (1978) (predecessor statute). However, a non-law-enforcement agency may withhold information under section 552.108 if the information relates to possible criminal conduct and has been or will be forwarded to an appropriate law enforcement agency for investigation. See Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982), Open Records Decision No. 493 (1988); see also Open Records Decision No. 372 (1983) (where incident involving allegedly criminal conduct is still under active investigation or prosecution, law enforcement exception may be invoked by any proper custodian of information which relates to incident). A governmental body that claims information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why section 552.108 is applicable to the information. See Gov't Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); see also *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977); Open Records Decision No. 434 at 2-3 (1986).

You indicate that the information at Tab 7 pertains to on-going investigations by the Medicaid Program Integrity ("MPI") unit of the commission's Office of Investigations and Enforcement regarding possible violations of Medicaid regulations. You also state that the commission is required to cooperate with the Medicaid Fraud Control Unit ("MFCU") of the Office of the Attorney General and other law enforcement agencies in appropriate cases. You indicate that MPI intends to refer this investigation to MFCU depending on the results of MPI's investigation. Based on these representations, we conclude that the responsive information at Tab 7 may be withheld pursuant to section 552.108(a)(1). See *Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177, 186-87 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), writ *ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases).

In summary, pursuant to section 552.110(a), the commission must withhold the information submitted at Tabs 2-6. The responsive information at Tab 7 may be withheld pursuant to section 552.108(a)(1). As our ruling on these issues is dispositive, we need not address Heritage or the commission's remaining arguments.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).


If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this

ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. McElroy', written over a horizontal line.

Denis C. McElroy
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DCM/lmt

Ref: ID# 188773

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Scott Tatum
Davis & Davis, P.C.
P.O. Box 1588
Austin, Texas 78767
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Thomas A. Forbes
Kemp Smith, P.C.
816 Congress Avenue, Suite 1650
Austin, Texas 78701-2443
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Carol D. Meisel
Client Delivery Executive
EDS
12545 Riata Vista Circle
Austin, Texas 78727
(w/o enclosures)